

THE
MORAL REFORMER.

No. 9.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1833.

Vol. III.

RELIGION AND MONEY.—PAUL'S DISINTERESTEDNESS.

NOTHING are more irreconcilable than religion and the love of money; and yet, if we were to judge from *appearances*, nothing seems so bad to separate. Although the incongruity of the connection has always been admitted, yet from some cause or other it has never been dissolved. It is a subject of constant remark and of incessant complaint, even by many who neither seek out the cause, nor try to apply a remedy. Every body seems dissatisfied, and yet no body has dared sufficiently to investigate the matter so as to lead to a removal of the evil. It is obvious that *fashionable religion* depends as much upon the "supplies" as the carrying on of government, and is governed by "estimates" as much as a water-works or a rail-road. Flourishing funds will procure fine temples and popular preachers; and these are things in which many place the essence of religion. Money! Religion—modern religion—lives, and moves, and has its being in *money*. Christianity! if thou hadst not honour and wealth to bestow, instead of being caressed by kings and courtiers, and followed by a numerous retinue in the land, thou wouldest be cast out, and none but the poor, the obscure, and the despised would take thee in. Assume thy *native* character, and the question would again recur, "Have any of the rulers believed on him?"

The cause of this is to be found in the cupidity and avarice of the interested, and in the mistaken opinions of others less guilty. While religion is made to consist of a priestly order, with costly robes, a pompous ritual service, performed in splendid temples made with hands, *money* may well be regarded as the one thing needful, and we need not wonder at the inventions set on foot to obtain it. If Protestants were but faithful to their principles, would stick by the New Testament, and adopt its principles upon this subject, they would soon discover their errors. They would

see that wealth corrupts religion, invites into its service only *pretended* friends, and seeks a compliance with the maxims and policy of the world, and that the prosperity of religion is not to be measured by modern standards, but by the personal and practical good produced in the hearts and *lives* of its professors.

"I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring, ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.' " Acts. xx. 33—35.

In these words of Paul are found the true spirit of Christianity, and they give a literal statement of the apostolic conduct. It is not unimportant to know to *whom* this address was made. It was delivered, not to private members of the church, but to the *bishops*, to those appointed to watch over the flock, and to feed the church of God. And I may remark, in passing, that primitive customs are so changed, that while, in these days, we have one bishop to a number of churches, there were then a *number* of bishops to one church. These consisted of those Christians, who, by their excellency of character, were considered fit to take the "oversight" of their brethren, and to teach and admonish them, and who were chosen accordingly. They were not called to travel like missionaries, but being stationed at one place, were able, like Paul when at Corinth, to work with their own hands. And being a number of them in one society, they were able to join at the work, and thus the labour was rendered less onerous. "Bishops and deacons" are what, according to the order of the New Testament, belong to every church, and so soon as there was an opportunity of deciding who were fit, these were appointed. The qualifications of these are so utterly at variance with what is now expected, both in the church and among dissenters, that I beg my readers to turn over to the passages in which these are described. 1 Timothy iii. 1—7. Titus i. 5—9. And those who wish to obtain a Scriptural view of the duties of Christian bishops, I refer to the following passages: 1 Peter v. 1—4; 1 Thessalonians v. 12 13; Hebrews xiii. 17; and Acts xx. 28—36. These passages will shew, that the primitive bishops were altogether unlike either our diocesan lords or our youthful academicians. And as it is this change in the character of the officers of the church, which has been the greatest cause of its corruptions, the love of filthy lucre always predominating, it is of the first importance that every Christian reformer should look to it. It is true, we retain the name "bishop," but there is scarcely

any other correspondent feature between those of primitive and modern times. The former were plain men, taken from among their brethren, and qualified by their personal excellences and their disinterested zeal to serve the cause of the church.

"I have coveted (desired) no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know that *these hands* have ministered to my necessities, and to those that are with me." Where are the bishops that can adopt this language? And if this could be done by *an apostle*, in the *infancy* of Christianity, when the importance of the object seemed to forbid the possibility of secular labour, now that it has been so long established, and with circumstances so much in its favour, those who sustain inferior offices, may be expected to labour too. The *disinterestedness* of the first preachers is often referred to as a proof of the *genuineness* of our religion: what a pity that we have not the same living evidence to refer to, in order to convince the unbelievers in our day! We pretend to reverence the memory of the apostles, and even to dedicate churches to their names; but if these tent-making, fish-catching preachers were to appear among us now, in their primitive character, they would be generally disowned by those who are lavish in their praises of religion.

Many pastors, perhaps, might say, "We do not covet either silver or gold; and though we cannot hold out our *hands* as having been the instruments of our own and others' support, yet we seek nothing beyond a bare subsistence." I believe there are many worthy men who are entitled to this plea, whose motives are as pure as the apostles, but whose connections, at the same time, prevent their sincerity from becoming manifest. But will this apply to those who choose the ministry as they would choose any other trade, whose education is conducted with the design of profit, and whose constant changes evidently bespeak a predominant love of money?

But while *missionaries*, that is, persons who are constantly travelling from place to place, need to be supported, *bishops*, whose official duties consist in watching over the flock in one place, need not to be supported, and are here commanded to imitate Paul, in not only *supporting themselves*, but assisting to *support others* also. This is a distinction in offices which should always be attended to, and which Paul illustrated in his own example. When travelling, or going about labouring in word or doctrine, he disdained not to take *casual* assistance from his friends, but when settled at certain places, as at Ephesus and Corinth, he wrought with his own hands. If we had bishops of the primitive stamp, plain, sincere, exemplary Christians, who had not been educated at the college to live by preaching; if their work

was understood to consist, not in making and delivering sermons, as the exclusive teacher of a congregation, but in a constant oversight of the conduct and behaviour of their brethren, and giving useful advice and admonition, both private and public; if a number in each society was appointed to this good work from among themselves, instead of a *single* individual from a distance, who is perhaps a mere hireling,—we should soon feel ourselves in a situation for appreciating and adopting the apostle's advice; and until a considerable change takes place in conducting the meetings of Christians, this advice can never be made to apply.

Paul not only ministered to his own necessities, but to those who were with him. Upon which he exhorts the bishops *to labour to support the weak*, and to remember the words of Jesus, that it is more blessed to *give* than to *receive*. I particularly wish to remark the misapplication of this passage: it is constantly quoted as if it were a *general* exhortation, whereas it was given to *bishops only*; and although it is useful to all, it was at the time when delivered intended *exclusively* for *bishops*. What a change would take place, if these men became *givers* instead of *receivers*! And why should not they be “more blessed,” as well as others? The apostle insists upon it, as the command of the Lord Jesus; but this can never take place till the Scriptural office of bishop is better understood, and till we have a different order of men appointed.

When the church was poor, it was most pure, and the members sincere and active. So soon as it became possessed of wealth, wicked men became tempted to put on a profession of religion and to creep into offices for the sake of gain. Religion, as a consequence, degenerated into formal services, which depended upon wealth for their support, and upon priests for their performance. It ceased to bear a direct connection with heaven, and to maintain its progress by a spiritual influence only. It became an engine of state, and accordingly was so modefied as to serve the political purposes of its patrons. For fifteen centuries it has been in trammels, and has been the greatest source of revenue to idle and undeserving men. To endeavour to depict the wars and cruelties which popular religion has been the occasion of, would be to narrate the blackest events in the history of the world. And although we are often most violent in our denunciations of a law established religion, yet it is evident that many of the same features may be retained where the law of establishment is not that of the statute book but that of a *party*. And hence the incessant complaints which we now hear among dissenters, of the oppressive religious imposts to which they are obliged to submit. When we read the newspapers, the

"Record" particularly, the magazines, reports of societies, &c., there seems to be nothing so much pressed upon our attention as the want of money. But when we come to read the New Testament, how great the reverse! Money matters are rarely even hinted at; and "collections," when they are mentioned, are *always for the poor*.

Many are the direful effects produced by a mercenary Christianity. Those who can give liberally are exalted above others in a society, although comparatively destitute of the virtues of a true Christian. The poor are also despised and neglected. Strife and divisions in societies are never wanting, and I have often remarked that they generally arise out of money matters, and have a connection either with the chapel or the preacher. Ritual services are greatly multiplied, which suit themselves to a priestly order, and which have an evident tendency to lead to the neglect of personal and practical religion. If religious meetings were conducted with the same simplicity as they were in apostolic times, the talents, and zeal, and love of many Christians would be brought into exercise, who are now doomed to comparative inactivity. Instead of being obliged to listen to the tedious discourses of a hired preacher, we should have our meetings edified by the plain and sincere exhortations of those who are denominated "laymen." We should then appreciate the apostle's words: "Ye may all prophecy one by one; that all may hear and all may be edified." Sectarian pride, which is so prevalent, is fed by this money; and hence, each party, instead of aiming at the conversion of the world, and the bringing in of the abandoned characters, is more anxious to maintain its popularity by getting rich and respectable members. Too often do they bite and devour each other, instead of joining together to reclaim the world. What is that which perpetually sounds in our ears from these parties but the want of money! Fashion is followed in religion as in every other worldly affair, and through following this, it is lamentable to observe how embarrassed many poor sects are in their financial affairs. But I maintain that the system of religion, as promulgated by Christ and his apostles, ought to be maintained in its purity, that it ought not to be made the stalking-horse of mercenary men, and that it is the only system which is calculated to save the world. The *avarice* of men and *sectarian pride* are the occasion of the change which has taken place, and which must be seriously lamented by every good man.

What then would you advise to be done? some may be ready to ask. I would advise, that, instead of giving so much importance to "a cause," or making the *prosperity of a chapel* an object of the *first* importance, the

people be *every where* taught, in every part of the country; that the importance of personal, practical, and every-day piety be enforced, and that attending any meetings should not be regarded as religion, but merely a means of acquiring it. Every Christian should teach his neighbour, and endeavour to spread abroad, in every possible way, the principles of religion. We should not depend upon *official* characters so much, but *all* begin to labour according to our means. Christianity is a system of benevolence; *teaching* it is the *exercise* of this virtue; and I conceive it to be as much our duty to do this, *without any pecuniary reward*, as to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. The man who acts, for instance, as the agent of the Samaritan Society, might as well expect his pay after visiting several sick families, as the teacher of religion, after delivering his discourse, or performing a service. What any of the first preachers of the gospel received, was not *remuneratory* for *teaching*, but *support* for *labour*. The labour mentioned, and which is said to be worthy of its hire, is compared to the labour of *soldiers, shepherds, ploughmen, thrashers, and husbandmen*. It was not the labour of the study or the pulpit. It was travelling about from place to place; and in this sense, well might an apostle ask, who *goeth a warfare* at his own charges? It comes to this: All *teaching*, in *itself*, is a work of *benevolence*; and in places where there are congregations of Christians established, it can generally be done, and ought to be done, by the members, without any pecuniary consideration; (and, if existing talent were encouraged, *would be done*, with much greater advantage than at present, though not so satisfactorily to fashionable people;) but if there were occasion for other places to be visited, which require men to travel from home, and lose their time, they must—and will without difficulty, if they be worthy men—be supported. When Christ sent his apostles, two and two, through all the cities of Israel, which was a real missionary tour, he said, “the workman is worthy of his meat:” though he said nothing of “livings” or “salaries,” nor of “bonds” to secure them, nor of *compulsory* measures for raising the means. This difference accounts for Paul sometimes taking assistance, and at other times labouring for himself, and for those who were with him. The *disinterested* Christian will seldom make a mistake here, whether he be a giver or receiver.

If we were to dispense with the services of hirelings, who learn their trade at the academy, who from plain John become *Reverend*, whose usefulness moves with the prospects of increased salary, who are spoiled by the *exclusive* view they take of their office, from either returning to their

own trade or even occasionally working at it.—we should need no fine chapels; the expence of meeting houses would, at least, be reduced from thousands to hundreds; there would be fewer rich attending; less chapel ostentation; but religion would be where it was in Christ's day, among the *poor*, and that at their homes, and in their general deportment. Plain, sincere Christians would then meet together in upper rooms, in any convenient place, to teach and exhort one another in love, and would abandon all that chapel and pulpit finery, all that mockery of true edification produced by learned sermons, after which the world seems mad at present, and which passes for religion. Disputes about money would be then unknown; no distinction of poor and rich by pew rents; no teasing collections; and that which is now so lavishly bestowed upon the trappings of Christianity would then be spared, as it was in Paul's day, for the relief of "the poor saints."

I doubt not by these remarks I shall provoke the ire of many, who will still stick to their "order," who, instead of ingenuous argument, will revive the cry and charge of infidelity. Others, who cannot see the comprehensive and systematic workings of this principle of mammon, and who are yet well disposed for Christian reform, I may not suit. But let me say to both parties, if I know my own heart, my only motive in the course I take, is, if possible, to assist in bringing back Christianity to its original purity and primitive loveliness, to make it the occasion of producing the *power* instead of the *form* of godliness, and to assist in breaking the *golden* chain of Anti-Christ, by which the Church of God has been bound for fifteen centuries. Those who connect religion with the "loaves and fishes," and those who, anxious for the manna from heaven, will even go out on the Sabbath to seek it, I leave to answer for themselves. This is my impression—and I wish, as much as possible, to produce the same upon all *teachers*—that "it is more blessed to *give* than to *receive*."

CLERICAL AUDACITY.

Of all the specimens of cant and impudence which I have met with, the following, from the "Record" of August 5th, stands preeminent. I have marked some parts in italics, to ensure attention, but I am sure comment is quite unnecessary. Notwithstanding the quackery of the case, it is astonishing to find, at the foot of the advertisement, a sum subscribed not less than £244.

HEBREWS, CHAP. VI. VER. 10.

A Clergyman, the Rector of a Village in Buckinghamshire, who has served *his Master* now for some years, and whose labours and ministry God has been pleased to own and make

very useful, is constrained to cast himself upon the Church for help, under the following circumstances :—

In the days of *his ignorance and unbelief* his affairs became involved, partly by a literary and political speculation, and partly by a very large outlay of money in erecting a farmhouse and farm-buildings for the occupation of his glebe, *preparatory to his building a parsonage for himself*. His living consequently became deeply encumbered, and has ever since remained so. Three years ago, he saw it right to give up, by a deed of trusteeship, the residue of the living, to the gradual discharge of his other claims; contenting himself with maintaining his family (a wife and five children, who shared in his feelings and contentment) upon a small Curacy which he held, and still holds, in the hope that time would gradually, however slowly, liquidate these claims, and set him free. This expectation has now totally failed, through the great *fall of his rents* within that period, and extrication is now utterly hopeless. The whole proceeds of the living, *when the duty is provided for*, are now very nearly absorbed by the encumbrances. In this extremity, having no other hope, all his plans of extrication having failed, he is cast upon the love of the Church for that which of all earthly things is *nearest his heart—the redemption of his living*, that he may be enabled to live and labour among an attached and beloved people. He visits them, and ministers among them, from time to time, and has done so for the last seven years. And the blessing that rests on his ministry, the great love shown to him by his parishioners, especially the poor among them, and *the strong desire they have for him to come and live among them*,—while it is in one point of view comforting to him, in another, is an aggravation of his distress.

Completely to effect this redemption, the trust-deed claimants have most kindly and liberally offered to forego two-thirds, or, if necessary, three-fourths of their claims, provided the remainder can be raised. The sum of from £2,000 to £2,600 would be necessary, *including the expense of building a parsonage house, without which residence is impossible*. The plan for raising this, or part of this sum (there being three distinct purposes, to either of which a part of the sum may be applied, if only part be raised) which is earnestly submitted to the Christian public, is, for each person before whom this statement comes, kindly, and in love, to make it known among the circle of his Christian friends and connections, and *collect offerings* from them, in addition to what he himself may be led to contribute, it being obvious that the efforts must be *vigorous*, and the offerings in accordance; such offerings to be transmitted to the Rev. &c. &c.—“For the Use of the Rector of a Village in Buckinghamshire.”

CRUELTY.—A DUCK HUNT.

How many are the inventions of the votaries of cruelty! We have bull-baiting, bear-baiting, cock-fighting, dog-fighting, man-fighting, racing, and hunting, all of which bespeak either a cruelty of disposition or a criminal conformity to barbarous and wicked customs. The other day, I went to witness what I have frequently heard of—a *duck hunt*. About twenty men, with seven dogs in their keeping, who had obtained a poor duck, were assembled at a pit on Preston Moor. The poor

bird was turned into the water, and the dogs set upon it with all their ferocity. I watched the scene about half an hour, till my feelings would not permit me to stay longer. The men surrounded the pit to prevent its escape, and the dogs continued to pursue it till they were almost fainting for breath. I presume this was continued till the poor animal was seized by the fangs of its pursuers. I scarcely know any sport more cruel. In cocks and dogs there is frequently a natural antipathy, which, when encouraged by brutal men, excites to attacks upon each other; and the race horse may be said to be actuated by an ambition in the contest; but nothing in nature but wanton cruelty, or sheer idleness, could lead a set of men to hunt down a poor, harmless, unresisting duck by savage dogs. The man that can take pleasure in this must be a stranger to the feelings which humanity alone would teach. The most awful oaths were uttered by some of the party; and I very much fear that the sport terminated in such excesses as all such pursuits do. I remonstrated with the most respectable of them, and though I was answered by an attempted defence of the practice, it was evident that the admonition was felt, and that the presence of myself and friend was a drawback upon their pleasure. I think it is the duty of every Christian, who wishes to see his country reformed, to visit all such scenes as this.

MALT LIQUOR.

Sir,—Having observed an extract from "Martin's Taxation of the British Empire," on the "good effects of malt liquor," full of groundless assertion, false reasoning, and moral poison, going the round of the public press, may I be permitted, through your Reformer, to offer a few remarks by way of antidote?

The extract commences with an assertion, that "good malt liquor, taken in moderation, is the most wholesome beverage that a nation can consume;" and this position the author attempts to prove by another assertion, that "the saccharine principle of barley, combined with the bitter quality of the hop, renders it nutritious and tonic in the highest degree." It is obvious, Sir, that Mr. Martin has not investigated the subject on which he so confidently speaks, and I cannot but think that the politician could be put to the blush by some of our humblest artisans. But this is the "great delusion" by which the people of England, and especially our statesmen, seem to be deceived; and what is still more to be lamented, even most of the advocates of Temperance Societies, in this country, with the exception of Preston, have acquiesced in the prevalent opinions. But let us see on what foundation Mr. Martin, the great admirer of malt liquor, stands. I could have wished he had condescended to have been more explicit on this head; but he seems to have thought that proof was not needful where none is ever sought. He appears, however, to have learned, by some means or other, that *barley* contains a saccharine principle, which is most true; and then he fancies that this saccharine principle is contained in "good malt liquor," which

is for the most part false. I presume, as Mr. Martin is so strong an advocate for home brewing, he must have often witnessed the process. Perhaps he may have occasionally eaten a grain of barley, and found that it possessed little sweetness; perhaps he has eaten a grain of malt, and found it very sweet; perhaps he has tasted a little wort, and found it still sweeter; and I cannot doubt that he has drunk of "good malt liquor," and found that the sweetness had disappeared: if it had not, he would have withheld the epithet "*good*," and have pronounced it *new*, and unfit for the beverage of a "*sturdy*" Englishman. Although all this Mr. Martin has most probably done, there is one thing which he appears to have neglected: he has never inquired into the *reason* of the changes he may have witnessed. The fact is, that barley contains less saccharine matter than malt, the saccharine matter of malt is dissolved in wort, and "good malt liquor" contains much less than any of the three. The *reason* is, the barley contains a large proportion of starch, which is much more nutritious than sugar. The relative nutriment of the two any one may prove by taking a table spoonful of each, and dissolving them in water, and then drinking the solutions at different times. He will find that the starch will furnish him with a good supper, while the sugar will afford him a meager meal. When barley is subjected to the process of malting, much of the starch disappears, and an equal increase of sugar is discovered, so that we must conclude that starch is converted into sugar by the partial germination the grain is made to undergo. If starch is converted into sugar, and sugar is less nutritious than starch, a portion of nutriment is destroyed, unless the quantity of sugar gained be much greater than the quantity of starch lost, which is not the case. If Mr. Martin, and those who entertain the same opinion, are not satisfied with this reasoning, let him and them procure equal weights of good barley and malt, and try which will make the most nutritious gruel. Perhaps Mr. Martin may have had the misfortune to eat bread made from grain that had begun to germinate, and if he have, he would doubtless think it less nutritious than bread made from grain which had not begun to germinate. This change is owing to the same cause as that in germinated barley, the conversion of starch into saccharine matter, and if in the one case the change be injurious to the grain, it is in the other. *Unsoundness* of the wheat is a great loss to the country, by occasioning a deficiency of food, but not more so than the conversion of barley into malt, and precisely for the same reason. In the first case, however, man is not his own tormentor; in the other he is. Germinated wheat occasions much sickness, but infinitely less than germinated barley.

The next process in forming "good malt liquor" is to dissolve the saccharine matter of the malt in water, to form wort, and the brewer is always careful to reject as much of the starch, which the malt contains, as he can. That is, he is so desirous of making a "wholesome beverage, nutritive in the highest degree," that he rejects the most valuable part of the nutriment in the very first process, and retains only the inferior portion of the nutriment. Wort, however, does contain a considerable quantity of nutriment, and were it drunk, would not be an unwholesome beverage. But it has to undergo another process, which is called *fermentation*.

During *fermentation*, the wort loses its sweetness; the saccharine matter disappears, and a new compound is formed, which has received the strange appellation of *spirit*, or *alcohol*. The latter of these terms is of Arabian extraction, and was given by the alchemists to denote the *perfection* to which art could bring the saccharine principle of vegetables. The term is well applied, if we consider it as indicating a substance *perfectly useless* as a

beverage, and that the destruction of valuable food can be carried no further. Alcohol is allowed by all to be scarcely, if at all, nutritious, so that the saccharine principle, which Mr. Martin esteems as highly nutritious, disappears during the fermentation, and an in nutritious new compound is formed when the wort is changed into "good malt liquor." Ale does undoubtedly contain some nutriment, as may be ascertained by driving off the water and spirit by heat. The extractive matter, however, is small, and consists chiefly of gum and gluten, which are greatly inferior in nutritious properties to starch and sugar. And if Mr. Martin would take a bushel of barley, and convert it into malt, and then into "good malt liquor," and ascertain the quantity of extractive matter the "good malt liquor" contains, he would find at least two-thirds less than the barley contained, without making any allowance for the difference of quality of the ingredients.

I do not hesitate to admit that the bitter quality of the hop is highly tonic, and in some cases of disease, no doubt, malt liquor may be of the greatest service, from its combining the narcotic and bitter principles, and from its being grateful to the palate.

After making these groundless assertions, Mr. Martin goes on to state, that "the *hale* constitutions, sturdy dispositions, and phlegmatic temperament, which, in a preeminent manner, distinguished the old English yeomen, may be ascribed to the prevailing beverage of the people." I have always understood that a *hale* constitution was connected with a *sanguine* temperament; but Mr. Martin has adopted a different standard of health, and were he disposed to impersonify Hygeia, I suppose we should have a delineation of a flabby, pale-faced Esquimaux, or an unimpassioned Dutch dame: a ruddy, sanguine Saxon, on the contrary, he would probably consider as the image of disease. As for the "sturdy dispositions" which Mr. Martin so much admires, I am free to admit that they may, in part, owe their origin to the stupefying and stuififying effects of "good malt liquor;" but whether such dispositions are really desirable I have great doubts, and I am sure he will not get many to admire his taste for *phlegm*. But leaving this confusion of terms, I would call upon Mr. Martin to give us the proof of his assertions, "that the hale constitutions, which, in a preeminent manner, distinguished the old English yeomen, may be ascribed to the prevailing beverage of the people." Would it not have been more reasonable to ascribe the hale constitutions of old English yeomen to their living upon roast beef and plum pudding, and to their being engaged in invigorating occupations, or what is, I believe, the true cause, an hereditary robustness? Among inferior animals, we almost uniformly find the offspring partaking of the frame and constitution of the parent, and this, when uncounteracted by art or accidental disease, I am inclined to think, would as uniformly be found to be the case also in the human class of animals. Nothing, at all events, could be more unphilosophical than to ascribe the haleness of constitution, so much admired in our English yeoman, to an article of diet, slightly nutritious, while he partook plentifully of the most nutritious solid food, that uniformly conduces, in a healthy body, to a "hale constitution." Not satisfied with the great discovery, that the hale constitution of the old English yeoman is owing to "good malt liquor," this wise politician has discovered that it gives a character to nations. "Contrast," says he, "the jolly, good natured British farmer, with a hard hand, a red face, and a soft heart, his flagon of Yorkshire stings before him, and a dozen of chubby-cheeked urchins at his feet, contrast his character, physically and mentally, with the thin, sallow, sharp-faced, and irritable farmer of France and Italy, whose principal beverage is an acid, meager, weak-bodied wine," and then smile at the doctrine that "hale constitutions, sturdy dispositions, and phleg-

matic temperament are owing to good malt liquor." Passing over the elegant terms of "stingo," as applied to his beverage, and "urchins," as the offspring of Yorkshire ale drinkers, let us consider for a moment the author's happy hit, over which he seems to chuckle, rejoicing in the assurance that he has entirely silenced all lovers of strict temperance. No one will doubt that "good malt liquor" is the cause of "a red face," but that it ever gave rise to "a hard hand and a soft heart" will admit of as much question as that the "flagon of Yorkshire stingo" produced "the dozen chubby-cheeked urchins at his feet;" and equally doubtful is it that the "farmers of France and Italy are made thin, sallow, sharp-faced, and irritable, by drinking an acid, meager, weak-bodied wine." But Mr. Martin has discovered the cause of the difference among nations to be the different kind of beverage they use. Thus, he classes the English, Dutch, and German together, not because, as has been generally supposed, they have the same origin, but because they are all extensive consumers of malt liquor. And this is the reason why "they are proverbial for patience in labour, perseverance in purpose, and unwearyed generosity of character." The French and Italians take their character, as I have already observed, from their acid, meager wines; and the Irish and Highland Scotch owe their character to their fiery ardent spirits; so that for the future, when we want to know the character of a people, it will only be necessary for us to ascertain the kind of beverage they use, and we shall be able to determine with the utmost precision! "What has raised England, a small island in the Atlantic," asks Martin, "to the lofty station she now holds? Has it not been the industry, skill, and moral integrity of her sons—of her people at large—people which it grieves me to avow, are now sinking into an abyss of misery and vice, which hopeless, abject poverty inevitably engenders." We have before seen that this politician attributes the virtues of Englishmen, in former ages, to their "good malt liquor," so that in fact, the ultimate cause of England's lofty station is the consumption of ale by her sons, and if such be true, we have always the means in our power, of raising a nation in power and wealth. It would be in vain to prove that the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Carthaginians of old, all attained a lofty station without "good malt liquor." It would be folly to point to the Tartars and Mahomedans, and the French in more recent times, as having gained a lofty station, the two former people, without the use of any stimulating beverage, and the latter certainly without the aid of "good malt liquor." All this would weigh little against the fact that England has attained a lofty station, and England is a lover of "good malt liquor," although it is not every mind that is possessed of sufficient acumen to discover any connection between her prosperity and her favourite beverage.

But England, in Mr. Martin's eyes, has lost her ancient character and her social happiness, and all this he attributes to the high price of malt, and fancies that happiness can only be restored "*by repealing entirely the taxes on malt and hops.*" By this means he expects something like the feudal system to be restored, and to counteract all the demoralization and physical injuries which are usually ascribed to the working of large masses of human beings in confined manufactories. Vice, I suppose, would cease to be contagious, and close, impure atmospheres would no longer impair the bodily vigour, provided only the malt and hop taxes were removed, for that is the means, and the only means, by which "rural happiness can be restored." "This is not a mere agricultural question," continues the politician, "it is one which affects the vital condition of the whole of the labouring poor in the united kingdom. The taxation on malt, beer, and hops has contributed more than any other mea-

sure to demoralize, and to beget a desire for gin and other ardent spirits." If the latter assertion be true, the former will be admitted. But is it true that the difficulties of obtaining ale has occasioned the practice of spirit drinking? Most of our labouring population who have recourse to spirits as a beverage, I believe, first contract a love for ardent spirits by taking it disguised in "good malt liquor." In Lancashire, with the exception of Manchester and Liverpool perhaps, intemperance owes a great deal more to ale drinking than to spirit drinking; and of the numerous drunkards with whom I have conversed on the subject, I do not remember a single instance in which the practice of intoxication did not originate in partaking of "good malt liquor." Do the beer shops, I would ask Mr. Martin, vend ardent spirits or "good malt liquor?" I presume he will admit that the evils which they have brought upon our labouring population are not occasioned by the difficulties of procuring malt liquor, although he may not be disposed to go the length of some, and say, that they are manifestly owing to the facility of obtaining the means of intemperance. This would be too common place a deduction from the clearest premises for so discerning a logician as Mr. Martin to draw. I do not know if Mr. Martin, and those who agree with him on the subject, believe that the human mind is naturally depraved, and that the greater the facilities there are to the practice of vice and the more vicious will men almost invariably become; but whether they believe it or not, it is a generally received maxim, and one which admits of the clearest demonstration. We cannot have a better example than the recent alteration in the laws relating to beer. The beer bill was broached as a panacea for all our national evils. "Give the poor man cheap ale, and he will be content, and relinquish his love of ardent spirits." Cheap ale was given, and what has been the result? Increased demoralization, poverty, and discontent. To prove this, Mr. Martin must not speculate in his closet, but must go amongst the labouring population of our towns, and ask the wives and children of our artisans, nay, even the artisans themselves, if they find an increase of morality and comfort since they can purchase ale for a penny a gill: and they will, with one voice, thunder in his ear a terrific NO. Our legislatures even, who are generally the last to discern a national evil, are at this very time inquiring how they may remedy the evil of the late "beer bill." But then Mr. Martin says, "it is idle to talk of reducing the duty from 20s. 8d. to 10s. 4d. Nothing short of a complete abolition ought to satisfy the country." Mr. Martin is one of those who do not like to do things by halves, but who like sweeping political experiments; and the fact that doubling the consumption of beer has increased intemperance two-fold, is but an evidence to him, that doubling it again would prevent intemperance! That is, take away every barrier to indulgence, and every protection to virtue, and vice will cease to be pursued, and virtue will flourish! The beer bill brought revelling and beastly intoxication into almost every street, but Mr. Martin, and those who agree with him, will never be satisfied till they witness them invading the sanctuary of home, till every poor man's cottage becomes polluted with intemperance, and his children learn to sip of good home brewed vice, instead of purchasing it, as I have often witnessed them, at a beer shop for a penny.—"Some taxes," observes Mr. Martin, "press on the industry, others on the comforts, and others on the luxuries of the bulk or mass of the people; but the malt, beer, and hop taxes have struck a deadly blow at temperance and social order, which are the main springs of society, and the only strength (under the guidance of Divine Providence) of a nation." It is only necessary to state this assertion to shew its absurdity. The difficulties thrown in the way of intemperance have increased intoxication,

and a check upon what increases the disorder of society has sapped social order! This is a paradox which I leave to Mr. Martin to explain.

Now for the climax; and I must quote it in full: to omit a single word would mar its effect. "England may go on extending her cotton and woollen manufactures over the face of the habitable globe, but her crawling infants may be doomed to an infernal slavery, which no civilized or uncivilized country ever before witnessed; her lands may be covered with railroads and machinery, and her warehouses overflowing with merchandize; towns, and temples, and palaces may adorn our cities, and a glittering splendour surround the throne; but if, in the midst of all these indications of national wealth, her people are becoming every day more and more unsettled, more dissolute, more impoverished (and the spirit rises while the bodily frame sinks from inanition) then indeed the very symbols of prosperity are but the gildings which adorn the sepulchre, and conceal the rottenness which is within."—The mountains are in labour, and a little mouse is brought forth; for if the malt and hop taxes are not entirely abolished, every hope is cut off; our yeoman will become like those of France and Italy, "thin, sallow, sharp-faced and irritable," for want of "good malt liquor" to drink! Nay, the whole mass of the population will pine away under the dreadful, and awful alternative of being compelled to drink a destructive and demoralizing beverage called water, or an innutritious and poisonous one called milk! No industry, skill, commercial enterprise, and facilities of internal conveyance can bear up against such fearful beverages! All our civilization, freedom, and wealth are but empty visions, that will soon fade away, and "leave not a wreck behind!"

Mr. Martin, unfortunately, is not the only person who has made the splendid discovery, that the malt and hop duties are the causes of all our national grievances, and so soon as the legislature can be induced to abolish them, our burdens will fall from the nation's back like "snow from a dyke's side." So convinced are the members of the reformed House of Commons of this, that they actually suffered a motion for the abolition of the malt tax to be carried, and had it not been for the interference of his Majesty's Ministers, this measure would have been successfully accomplished; and the government only interfered from an apprehension of an income tax becoming absolutely necessary, for they also appear to be believers in this wonderful panacea for the nation's diseases. But laying aside my admiration of the delusion that seems to envelop all classes in the grossest misconception on this subject, let us examine the matter with the coolness its great importance merits. This I purpose briefly to do under three heads: first, as connected with the revenue; secondly, as it affects the means of subsistence; and, thirdly, as it affects the happiness of the nation.

First, as connected with the revenue. The revenue for 1830 was £54,840,100, of which sum £16,213,383 was raised from the consumption of intoxicating liquids. The malt and hop duty produced, in 1832, more than 5 millions. Now, no one can for a moment suppose, that under the present debt and necessities of the government, so large a sum as this could be spared from the revenue; so that if this duty were taken off malt, some other means must be adopted to raise an equal sum. So convinced were the House of Commons of this, that they reversed the decision which, on the motion of Sir W. Ingilby, they had too hastily formed on the subject. It certainly appears to me by far the least oppressive kind of taxation to lay the duties upon such articles as are not essential to human existence; and if there be any substances which are of extensive consumption, and which rather tend to promote crime, immorality, and poverty, a heavy tax upon such substances I should consider of the greatest benefit to

society at large, by furnishing a check upon the abuse of them. Now, it can be proved beyond all disputation, that a very large proportion of the crime, poverty, and disease of this country owe their origin to the free use of intoxicating liquors. It is equally demonstrable, that these liquors are not necessary to human existence, or even comfort; and no one will dispute, that abstinence from such liquors, as beverages, can be attended with any evil result. These assertions being granted (and who will question their truth?) it follows, as a matter of course, that a tax upon intoxicating liquors is not merely a tax upon luxuries, but a check to crime, poverty, and disease; and as such, it must be beneficial to a country. Surely, it must contribute to the safety and prosperity of a nation, to prevent intemperance and all its numerous and fearful evils; and what can be a stronger prevention than raising the cost of the means of indulgence beyond the reach of the vicious? Besides being a check to evil, I consider the taxes upon intoxicating liquors as a bonus for sobriety. This may appear to be paradoxical, but I will explain the seeming contradiction. A man may be rewarded as well by refraining from making demands upon the product of his labour as by a direct gift. And this is precisely the case with the malt tax. A certain amount of revenue is necessary for the exigencies of the state, and this amount must be exacted from the country in one form or another. If it be demanded in a direct tax from every individual, whether as an income tax, a property tax, or an assessed tax, the burden falls upon every person possessed of a certain amount of income, of property, or of a house, irrespective of his character; but when the tax is laid upon articles of consumption that are not essential to existence, every man may, by abstinence, avoid sustaining any part of the public burden; so that the revenue may be regarded as a voluntary contribution: and when the tax is laid upon what is injurious to the moral, physical, and economic interests of the people, it is tantamount to a declaration, that all who will live temperately and rationally shall have the privilege of living in the country, and enjoying the benefits of its government, free from tribute, while those who are resolved to indulge in vice shall pay a fine for every indulgence. I know it is said by some, that "they are the best patriots who contribute the most largely to the revenue of a state, while they who contribute little have small share to any privileges or claims on the constitution." This, however, appears to me to be a great error, for it proceeds on the principle that a nation's power and prosperity depend on the amount of funds it has at its disposal, while public and private virtue are the only stable foundations of a nation's greatness and a nation's strength. Wealth always excites envy and creates many enemies, while virtue commands the esteem of even the vicious. Besides, in strict justice the wicked should pay the greatest part of the expence of government. A good man needs no government but that of heaven; and could we find a nation of good men, laws would be superfluous, magistrates unnecessary, and wars would be unknown. Now, remove from this nation the expence of legislation, the cost of executing the laws, and the support of wars, and the burdens consequent upon them, and the remainder would be trifling indeed. To me it appears that the virtuous should only pay a share of what remains after these deductions are made, while the vicious, for whose restraint, punishment, or gratification, all the rest is incurred, should sustain nearly the whole of our present revenue. I think there are few considerate persons who will dissent from the proposition, that a direct tax is always odious, that an indirect tax is always the least burdensome, and just in proportion to the unnecessary nature of the articles upon which it is laid. If this be admitted, surely no one will ever dream of substituting an income or property tax for those on malt and hops. At all

events, before such a proposition is again thought of, it cannot certainly be thought to be unreasonable to request those who bring it forward, to be first fully convinced, from correct premises, that "good malt liquor" is nutritious in the highest degree, and contributes materially to public and private virtue. It would be but a poor proof of legislative wisdom, to sacrifice £5,000,000 of revenue a year, to an unfounded assumption. In 1830, £27,507,763 14s. 1d. of revenue was raised from the consumption of spirits, wines, malt, beer, hops, sugar and molasses, tea, coffee, tobacco, and snuff, while the whole revenue of the year was £54,840,190 0s. 4½d., so that more than one half of the taxes that year was paid in the shape of a gratuity for indulgence.

Secondly. The malt tax, as it affects the means of subsistence. For the sake of argument I will suppose that it requires a bushel of barley to make a bushel of malt. Barley contains fifty per cent. of nutriment, and perhaps, on an average, two quarters of barley would support one individual for a whole year. By the process of germination, which the barley is made to undergo in malting, at least one-third of the nutriment is lost, so that instead of fifty per cent., we have now only 37.34 per cent. of nutriment left: and while six quarters of barley would support three individuals for one year, six quarters of malt would only support two individuals for the same period. The quantity of malt which paid duty in 1832 was 40,334,987 bushels. If it take a bushel of barley to form a bushel of malt, at the rate of two quarters for an individual, the above mentioned quantity of grain would have supported 2,520,936 individuals; but if used in the form of malt, it would only have supported 1,680,624 individuals; so that by the process of malting alone, that year, food for 840,312 persons was destroyed. But the mischief does not stop here. Malt is not used as an article of diet, but is converted into a beverage by fermentation. By this process we may reasonably conclude that another third of the nutriment is lost, after making allowance for that which is returned to us by the increase of the animals fed upon the refuse of the brewery. If this be true, in order to form a "beverage nutritious in the highest degree," we destroy food that would subsist 1,680,624 individuals. But even this is not the only injury the country sustains in provisions by the use of ale. In 1830, according to parliamentary documents, 46,726 acres of ground were occupied by the growth of hops. Now, hops are not food, so that, as it regards sustenance, this land must be regarded as waste. On a low average, each of these acres will produce three quarters of barley, so that, for the production of an innutritious plant land is cultivated that might be made to yield 140,178 quarters of barley, or food for 70,089 individuals. Thus, "good malt liquor," which is lauded by wise and simple, as the greatest boon that nature and art have combined to furnish for the nourishment and happiness of Englishmen, actually deprives this nation of nutriment sufficient for the support of 1,750,713 persons.

When a few stacks of grain were destroyed by malignant wretches, the country was shocked at the desperate deed; but when more than one-twelfth of the grain grown in the country is destroyed in the production of intoxicating liquors, it is esteemed a blessing to the nation; and could a double quantity be destroyed, legislators and politicians tell us we should be on the high road to happiness, morality, and plenty. If we suppose, with M'Culloch that one-seventh of the grain consumed in this country is imported, the effect of such a project would be tantamount to closing our ports in a year of scarcity, unless our imports were more than doubled.

Thirdly. That ale is not necessary to the happiness of the people, can be proved by very many instances of persons, in every station in life, possessing the most robust health, and enjoying every rational gratification, without tasting of it. We have even "yeomen," who would not have blushed to have stood by those of yore, who drink no malt liquor, and who will yet perform as much agricultural labour as any ale drinker of the same bodily power in England. That ale stimulates the physical powers, and produces a temporary, violent exertion of strength, I willingly admit; but that it contributes to the permanent strength of our labourers, will admit of the greatest doubt. When our coachmen find a horse flagging, they will administer a quart of ale to help him to the end of his journey, but I never heard of any one attempting permanently to increase the strength of a horse by habitually giving him malt liquor. Our bodies are subjected to the same laws that govern the economy of the horse, and what would be considered preposterous in the one case would be regarded as absurd in the other, did not custom hoodwink our reason, and prejudice blind our perception. Besides, intoxication from malt liquor initiates into a love of stronger stimulents, and begets a desire for ardent spirits, which even Mr. Martin deplores; and it would not be difficult to demonstrate, that much of the crime, poverty, and disease of the country owe their origin to the same source. If such be the case, "good malt liquor" is the cause of a large proportion of the misery in this country, and it will require a very acute logician to prove that what is the cause of misery is also the cause of happiness. This problem I leave to Mr. Martin and our legislators to solve.

A LOVER OF TEMPERANCE.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Mr. Editor,—With your permission, I would lay before your readers some observations respecting J. R.'s letter on Sunday schools, inserted in your last number.

Your correspondent observes, that neither Moses nor Joshua, nor yet Jesus nor his apostles, gave any directions about Sunday schools, and therefore concludes that these institutions are without any warrant in Scripture. Notwithstanding this, however, I humbly opine, that Sunday schools, Bible, Tract, and Missionary Societies, and other similar institutions, though never mentioned, in so many words, in the Scriptures, are perfectly in accordance with the spirit of the gospel of Christ, inasmuch as the object of all of them is to spread abroad the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, to convert sinners from the error of their ways, and to build them up in the faith of Christ.

We all agree that there is much evil in society as it exists at present. But are Sunday schools to blame for this? Yes, says J. R. and others, they are subversive of a Christian ministry, by which the evils of society should, and would have been prevented or remedied, had not these institutions interfered. It is argued, that the immoral state of society clearly shows, that our religious teachers have neglected their duty. But this is going rather too far: for if the prevalence of vice be a sufficient proof of what J. R. affirms, then may we presume to charge the Saviour himself and his apostles with dereliction of duty; for after all their exertions, and though we read of thousands being converted, and of vast numbers being added to the Lord, still the great mass of the people amongst whom they laboured remained slaves to sin, steeped in a state of spiritual darkness, and without hope and without God in the world.

J. R. says, "If we notice what it is that enables ministers to secure congregations capable of giving them their salaries, notwithstanding their daily, nay, we may say, their avowed neglect, we shall find Sunday schools to be their grand resource, out of which they hope to draft congregations, without having the trouble of going from house to house; thus evading the Scriptural example of a gospel ministry." Now, before we can judge of the justness or unjustice of this harsh and sweeping condemnation of our religious teachers, it is necessary to ascertain what is the duty of a gospel minister. And to resolve this problem we must go to the Scriptures of truth.

After the ascension of their Lord, and whilst the disciples were yet waiting for the Comforter, by whom they were to be enlightened in all spiritual things, and fully prepared for the work of the ministry, we find them repeatedly assembling themselves together in one place, for the purpose of divine worship. And the first great accession to the church, recorded Acts ii., was accomplished through the instrumentality of Peter, not by going from house to house, but by preaching Christ, and him crucified, to the multitudes who flocked to the meeting place of the disciples. Immediately afterwards, we read of about five thousand being converted by another sermon of Peter's, when the people ran together to the porch of the temple, on hearing of the miracle of healing performed on the man who had been lame from his mother's womb. In Acts v. it is repeatedly mentioned, that the apostles taught the people in the temple, and in the last verse of the chapter we are told that "daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." Here the words, "in every house," may seem to support the plans of teaching advocated by J. R.; but I think there can be little doubt that this, and a similar expression, Acts xx. 20, refer to meetings in the houses of the converts, similar to the private meetings for prayer and mutual edification amongst different religious parties at the present day. At the beginning of the sixth chapter, there is an incident recorded, which is quite decisive as to what is the proper employment of a gospel ministry. At this time, the disciples had multiplied greatly, and their zeal had induced those amongst them who had the means to contribute liberally of their substance to supply the wants of their necessitous brethren. Some irregularity appears to have arisen in the distribution of these funds, in consequence of which murmurings were excited amongst the disciples. To allay these disagreeable feelings, the apostles called the multitude together, and recommended them to elect a number of suitable persons to superintend the business, giving as their reason for this advice, "It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables." "We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word." From this it appears evident, that the proper employment of a minister of the gospel is not to attend to the wants of men's bodies, or the mere secular concerns of Christian life, so much as to supply the spiritual wants of his flock, to study the word of God with great diligence and attention, and to bring therefrom those spiritual treasures which are intended for converting sinners and edifying saints.

Not to extend this letter to an unreasonable length, I will briefly call the attention of J. R. and the readers of the Moral Reformer, to the ministerial labours of the apostle Paul, and then leave the subject to their meditations.

Acts xi. 26, we are told that Paul and Barnabas, "a whole year, assembled themselves with the church (at Antioch), and taught much people." And when travelling as missionaries among the heathen nations, it was the practice of Paul and his companions in labour

to enter the synagogues of the Jews, which were generally to be found in the various cities they visited, and address the congregations there assembled. At Philippi, where probably there was no synagogue, they went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made (on the Sabbath)." And at Athens, we read that Paul "disputed in the synagogue with the Jews, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him." At Corinth, Paul preached in the synagogue every Sabbath, as was his custom; but when violently opposed by the Jews, he entered into the house of a convert named Justus, and being encouraged by the Lord, who said to him in a vision, "I have much people in this city," he continued there teaching the word of God a year and six months. A similar scene occurred at Ephesus. For three months Paul taught in the synagogue, "but when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." Acts xix. 8, 10. When the apostle visited Troas, where he had formerly laboured and gathered a church, we are told, that the evening previous to his departure, the disciples came together in an upper chamber to break bread, and Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight. And I cannot help observing here, how disagreeable, had they been there, would this have been to certain modern professing Christians, who are apt to complain loudly of the great length of time spent, in our religious assemblies, in praying, singing, and sermonizing!

From all this we may learn, that the apostle was in the habit of meeting with those who felt, or at least expressed, some anxiety to learn the way of salvation, and of disputing with them, and reasoning concerning the great truths he was commissioned to promulgate; and when his labours were blessed to the conversion of souls, he was accustomed to form his converts into churches, meet with them in some fixed place, and preach to them and all who chose to attend the meetings. But it appears that he did not consider it obligatory to seek after those who would turn a deaf ear to his instructions, and who were blinded by the god of this world, perhaps remembering the Saviour's injunction, "Cast not your pearls before swine."

Now, the passages cited above directly militate against J. R.'s notion of the duty of religious teachers; and I would earnestly entreat him, and others who are in the habit of using the same line of argument, to consider the pernicious influence they are exerting on the minds of irreligious people, confirming them in their habitual neglect of God's worship, and affording them an excuse for their profane lives: they are led, by such groundless charges against the ministers of Christ, to lay their sin at the door of the preacher, when, in truth, it is they who will not come to the feast which is prepared for them, and where they would be joyfully received.

But perhaps I may be here asked, if I thus maintain that ministers of the gospel are properly employed in attending to the congregations they have collected around them, and to those who will come to their meetings, what must be done for the multitudes who never approach a place of worship? Do I not feel one emotion of compassion for the crowds who are heedlessly pursuing the downward paths which terminate in hopeless misery? Yes, I, and my fellow labourers in Sunday schools, have, I trust, often thought of, and mourned over, the depraved state of our population, and we have been led to do something (little

we must own) towards rescuing these victims suffering under the thrall of sin and satan. We have taken many of the stray "lambs" from the streets and the lanes, and are feeding them with the milk of the word. (And we shall continue our labours, notwithstanding the discouragements thrown in our way by J. R. and others.) Oh! yes, I feel so much for the sad state of these wandering sheep, that I implore J. R. and others, who seem to be in no way actively employed in Christian exertion, not to be content merely to write about the irreligious state of society, but to begin to *act*. If they choose not to engage with us in the religious instruction of the children of the poor, and if they like not any other of the various plans of doing good pursued by their Christian brethren, let them adopt their own scheme, and begin to go about from house to house, warning sinners of their danger, exhorting them to repent and believe, and urging them to attend the means of grace. And I am sure I speak with the concurrence of my fellow labourers in Sunday schools, when I say, that we shall not complain, nay, that we shall rejoice, when we behold J. R. and other Christians endeavouring to convert sinners in *their own way*. And when J. R. has thus laboured for years, when he has long striven with the heedlessness and obstinacy of sinners, and frequently seen them disappoint all his prayerful expectations, and when he has often experienced the struggles of his own heart, under the chilling impression, that, with all his exertions, he is doing little or no good, then I am persuaded he will feel little inclination to repeat his observation respecting the inefficiency of Sunday school instruction.

In reference to the lamentation of J. R. over the separation of the parents from their children, this objection, if it have any weight, is equally applicable to schools of every description, which, on other days, are filled with children, who are necessarily absent from their parents; but let J. R. consider what sort of an example those parents, for the benefit of whose children Sunday schools are designed, set before their offspring, and then let him say whether occasional separation, for the purpose of religious instruction, be an evil or not. And in reference, also, to the effects of punishment inflicted in Sunday schools, I would ask, is it in such places only that "angry feelings and unholy thoughts" are excited by necessary correction? This last noticed objection of J. R.'s, that of Sunday school teachers being "young, inexperienced men and women," and then again, the expression of his regret "that so many *parents* spend the whole of their Sabbath in the school," seem very like "mere theories written for the sake of finding fault." But I must forbear.

J. R. also says, Sunday schools "have now been in full operation twenty years, and yet the state of society is not a bit better." It is no easy matter to *prove* either the truth or falsehood of this assertion. It is like the lament we so often hear for the "good old times," which were so much better than our own times: but perhaps if we were as intimately acquainted with former times as we are with our own, we should not have so much reason as we imagine for dissatisfaction: and if, instead of scanning one little portion of what he calls "society," J. R. were permitted to look into all the million haunts of life throughout our land, and behold the doings of men in all their various pursuits; and supposing he were made as well acquainted with society as it existed twenty years ago; then, perhaps, when he would be fully competent to give an opinion, he might more justly appreciate the benefits derived from Sunday schools; then, if he could not pronounce the state of society to be a bit better, he might perhaps tell us how much worse it would have been if these institutions had never been established. But all such comparison of present with former times is mere trifling. It is a matter beyond our cognizance. We feel present evils: past things are but

dimly seen through the lapse of time, or spoken of to us by the aged, who look back to their youth, when health and enjoyment led them to look on the bright side of things.

And now, Mr. Editor, I ought to apologize to you for the great length of this communication; but I hope that you will not, on that account, refuse its insertion, considering the imputations that have been charged upon the institutions I have attempted to defend, and how much has appeared in the pages of your work on the other side of the question, but that you will permit your readers to consider the arguments on both sides, and judge for themselves.

A SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER.

August 7th, 1833.

It is with great pleasure I give insertion to the above letter, because it is calculated to lead to the discussion of subjects of vast importance—*the utility of Sunday schools, and the nature of the Christian ministry*. However I may differ with the writer on some points, or with "J. R.," one thing I will say, and I have often repeated the same, that Sunday school teachers and superintendents constitute the most laborious and disinterested class of Christians with which I am acquainted.—ED.

THE PRESS.

It is manifest that if the obligations which are urged apply to those who speak, they apply with tenfold responsibility to those who write. The man, who, in talking to half a dozen of his acquaintance, contributes to confuse or pervert their moral notions, is accountable for the mischief which he may do to six persons. He who writes a book containing similar language is answerable for a so much greater amount of mischief as the number of his readers may exceed six, and as the influence of books exceeds that of conversation by the evidence of greater deliberation in their contents and by the greater attention which is paid by the reader. It is not a light matter, even in this view, to write a book for the public. We very insufficiently consider the amount of the obligations and the extent of the responsibility which we entail upon ourselves. Every one knows the power of the press in influencing the public mind. He that publishes five hundred copies of a book, of which any part is likely to derange the moral judgment of a reader, contributes materially to the propagation of evil. If each of his books is read by four persons, he endangers the infliction of this evil, whatever be its amount, upon two thousand minds. Who shall tell the sum of the mischief? In this country the periodical press is a powerful engine for evil or for good. The influence of the contents of one number of a newspaper may be small, but it is perpetually recurring. The editor of a journal, of which no more than a thousand copies are circulated in a week, and each of which is read by half a dozen persons, undertakes in a year a part of the moral guidance of three hundred thousand individuals. Of some daily papers the number of readers is so great, that in the course of twelve months they may influence the opinions and the conduct of six or eight millions of men. To say nothing, therefore, of editors who intentionally mislead and vitiate the public, and remembering with what carelessness respecting the moral tendency of articles a newspaper is filled, it may safely be concluded, that some creditable editors do harm in the world to an extent, in comparison with which robberies and treasons are as nothing.

It is not easy to imagine the sum of advantages which would result, if the periodical press not only excluded that which does harm, but preferred that which does good. Not that

grave moralities, not, especially, that religious disquisitions, are to be desired; but that every reader should see and feel that the editor maintained an allegiance to virtue and to truth. There is hardly any class of topics in which this allegiance may not be manifested, and manifested without any incongruous associations. You may relate the common occurrences of the day in such a manner as to do either good or evil. The trial of a thief, the particulars of a conflagration, the death of a statesman, the criticism of a debate, and a hundred other matters, may be recorded so as to exercise a moral influence over the reader for the better or the worse. That the influence is frequently for the worse needs no proof; and it is so much the less defensible, because it may be changed to the contrary without a word, directly, respecting morals or religion.

However, newspapers do much more good than harm, especially in politics. They are in this country one of the most vigorous and beneficial instruments of political advantage. They effect incalculable benefit, both in checking the statesman who would abuse power, and in so influencing the public opinion as to prepare it for, and therefore to render necessary, an amelioration of political and civil institutions. The great desideratum is enlargement of views and purity of principle. We want in editorial labours less of partizanship, less of petty squabbles about the worthless discussions of the day: we want more of the *philosophy* of politics, more of that grasping intelligence which can send a reader's reflections from facts to principles. Our journals are, to what they ought to be, what a chronicle of the middle ages is to a philosophical history. The disjointed fragments of political intelligence ought to be connected by a sort of enlightened running commentary. There is talent enough embarked in some of these; but the talent too commonly expends itself upon subjects and in speculations which are of little interest beyond the present week.

And here we are reminded of that miserable direction to public opinion which is given in Historical Works.* I do not speak of party bias, though that is sufficiently mischievous; but of the irrational selection by historians of comparatively unimportant things to fill the greater portion of their pages. People exclaim that the history of Europe is little more than a history of human violence and wickedness. But they confound History with that portion of history which historians record. That portion is doubtless written almost in blood, but it is a very small, and in truth a very subordinate portion. The intrigues of cabinets; the rise and fall of ministers; wars, and battles, and victories, and defeats; the plunder of provinces; the dismemberment of empires;—these are the things which fill the pages of the historian, but these are not the things which compose the history of man. He that would acquaint himself with the history of his species, must apply to other and to calmer scenes. “It is a cruel mortification, in searching for what is instructive in the history of past times, to find that the exploits of conquerors who have desolated the earth and the freaks of tyrants who have rendered nations unhappy, are recorded with minute and often disgusting accuracy, while the discovery of useful arts, and the progress of the most beneficial branches of commerce, are passed over in silence and suffered to sink in oblivion.”† Even a more cruel mortification than this is to find recorded almost nothing respecting the intellectual and moral history of man. You are presented with five or six weighty volumes which profess to be a History of England; and after reading them to the end, you have hardly found any thing

* “Next to the guilt of those who commit wicked actions is that of the historian who gloses them over and excuses them.” Southey: Book of the Church, c. 8.

† Robertson: Disq. on Ant. Comm. of India.

to satisfy that interesting question,—How has my country been enabled to advance from barbarism to civilization; to come forth from darkness into light? Yes, by applying philosophy to facts yourself, you may attain some, though it be but an imperfect, reply. But the historian himself should have done this. The facts of history, simply as such, are of comparatively little concern. He is the true historian of man who regards mere facts rather as the *illustrations* of history than as its subject matter. As to the history of cabinets and courts, of intrigue and oppression, of campaigns and generals, we can almost spare it all. It is of wonderfully little consequence whether they are remembered or not, except as lessons of instruction,—except as proofs of the evils of bad principles and bad institutions. For any other purpose, Blenheim! we can spare thee. And Louis, even Louis “*le grand!*” we can spare thee. And thy successor and his Pampadour! we can spare ye all.

Much power is in the hands of the historian, if he will exert it, if he will make the occurrences of the past subservient to the elucidations of the principles of human nature,—of the principles of political truth,—of the rules of political rectitude;—if he will refuse to make men ambitious of power by filling his pages with the feats and freaks of men in power;—if he will give no currency to the vulgar delusions about glory:—if he will do these things, and such as these, he will deserve well of his country and of man; for he will contribute to that rectification of Public Opinion which, when it is complete and determinate, will be the most powerful of all earthly agents in ameliorating the social condition of the world.—

Dymond's Essays on the Principles of Morality.

PETITION OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS FOR THE ABOLITION OF
TITHES, &c.

To the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned, members of the religious Society of Friends, called Quakers, assembled at our Yearly Meeting in London, respectfully represent to parliament, that our Society has always objected, on principle, to Tithes, and other compulsory ecclesiastical claims.

We consider it to be our bounden duty to conform ourselves to the laws, and to obey the government of our country, in all things which do not interfere with the higher claims of conscience towards God; but, whenever there is such an interference, it is our established practice to refuse an active compliance with the law, and patiently to suffer the consequences.

On this principle, we have always refused the payment of Tithes, and other ecclesiastical demands; and, at the same time, have offered no opposition to the distrain of our goods for these purposes. In the earlier periods of the Society, its members were exposed to grievous sufferings and persecutions on this account. Not only were they despoiled of their property, in a vexatious and ruinous manner, but their persons were seized, and they were immured in dungeons, to the injury of their health, and, in many instances, even to the loss of their lives: and although the laws which render us liable to suits in the ecclesiastical courts are now but seldom enforced, we still suffer considerable injury from the levying of distrains, and from the exactions with which they are often accompanied.

Our reasons for refusing these payments are purely of a religious nature; and they are as follows:

First. That we regard the interference of the civil government, in matters of religion and private conscience, to be the usurpation of a prerogative which belongs only to God.

Secondly. That we consider the setting apart of Tithes for the maintenance of the ministers of religion, to have been an unwarrantable return to the provisions of the Levitical law, and at variance with the nature and character of the Gospel.

Thirdly. That we believe the ministry of the Gospel to be free in its nature, according to the command of our Lord and Saviour to his disciples: "Freely ye have received, freely give;" and that the contravention of this principle has an unfailing tendency to convert religion into a trade, and grievously to impede the diffusion of vital Christianity.

We also deem the compulsory support of the ministers of any church, and of an ecclesiastical system connected therewith, to be opposed to that liberty which the Gospel confers; and, when claimed from those who conscientiously dissent from that church, to be a violation of the common principles of justice.

Observing with satisfaction that the subject of Tithes and other ecclesiastical demands is likely to come under the deliberate review of the Legislature, we consider this to be the proper time for representing to Parliament these our Christian principles: and we respectfully beseech the House of Commons not to rest satisfied with any modification of the present system, but to take effectual measures for the entire removal of all such imposts.

In conclusion, we feel bound to express to Parliament our heartfelt prayer, that Almighty God may bless and preserve the Government and Legislature of our country, and may direct all their counsels for the happiness of the nation, for the welfare of mankind in general, and for his own glory.

Signed by six hundred and seventy-nine members of the Society of Friends, from various parts of the United Kingdom.

OBsolete ACTS OF PARLIAMENT.

When acts of parliament become at variance with the common sense of a nation, or are opposed to the high principle of *equity*, they should either be repealed or be suffered to slumber in inactivity. Most of our statutes respecting easter dues, obventions, obventions, &c. are of this character; and yet, so eager for filthy lucre are the clergy, that they are constantly resisting all remonstrances urged from the principles of propriety and equity, and are resting their claims upon some *antiquated* law. The following are quite as good statutes as theirs, and the man who at this day would dare to enforce them would deservedly stand as high in public estimation as they do.

"No person shall make, sell, or set upon any clothes, or wearing garments whatsoever, any buttons made of cloth, serge, drugget, frieze, camblet, or any other stuff of which clothes or wearing garments are made, or any buttons made of wood only, and turned in imitation of other buttons, on pain of forfeiting 40s. per dozen, for all such buttons." (7 Geo. 1, c. 7.)

"No tailor shall set on any buttons, or button-holes, of serge, drugget, &c. under penalty of 40s. for every dozen of buttons or button-holes so made or set on.

"No person shall use or wear, on any clothes, garments, or apparel whatsoever, except velvet, any buttons or button-holes made of or bound with cloth, serge, drugget, frieze, camblet, or other stuffs, whereof clothes or other garments are usually made, on penalty of forfeiting 40s. per dozen, under a similar penalty." (7 Geo. 1, c. 22.)

THE TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE.

GENERAL REMARKS.

I am not aware of any thing novel that can be reported this month of the Temperance Societies. It does not appear, from the sources of information to which I have access, that the work is carried on in most parts of the kingdom with that zeal which its importance demands, particularly as it respects suitable efforts for the reformation of drunkards, although among the reflecting part of the people the principles of temperance are evidently making progress. New Temperance Coffee Houses are being opened at Chorley and Lancaster. Mr. James, from Chorley, has entered upon the Preston Temperance Hotel, and I doubt not will conduct it in a superior manner, and give satisfaction to those who may favour him with their support. The temperance cause is extending itself to every village within nine miles of Preston, and in some of which—Kirkham, Longton, Garstang, and Hoghton, in particular—it is making rapid progress.

As the statements made by the Preston Temperance Society, of the number of drunkards who have been reclaimed through its exertions, have been doubted by many persons who reside at a distance, it has been thought desirable to give a brief account of some of those persons who are now reaping the benefit of sobriety, through the efforts and example of sober men in this town. Merely the initial letters of the name of each individual will be given, to avoid unnecessary exposure; but as the cases are notorious, it is hoped no one will dispute the veracity of the relations, which will frequently be given in the language of the reclaimed. Should, however, any one question their authenticity, I will hand over the names of the individuals, and will afford an opportunity of verifying the statements by an interview with the persons whose cases are here detailed.

CASES OF REFORMED DRUNKARDS.

1.—R. J., aged twenty-six years, a sawyer, the son of an intemperate parent, states, that when he was eleven years old, he was employed as an errand boy, by a hop and porter dealer in a neighbouring village. He frequently assisted in bottling porter. On such occasions he was always made to drink some of the liquor, and he remembers being once very much intoxicated with porter before he had attained the age of twelve years. In this employment he was engaged at intervals till he was seventeen years old. He was often sent on errands to public houses, where he not unusually got drunk. After he left this situation, he engaged in his present employment. At a footing he had to pay five shillings, to which was added sixpence a-piece by the other sawyers, and the whole expended in drink. When he became a sawyer, he began to drink freely of ale, under an impression that it was necessary to enable him to perform his labour. He was soon induced to drink to intoxication. He became a periodical and ultimately a confirmed and habitual drunkard. Before the habit became confirmed, he suffered much from a conviction of the criminality of intemperance: to stifle this conviction, he drank more copiously, and quieted his apprehensions by overpowering his reason. He has been drunk for five successive days, and remembers on one occasion expending £2 18s. in criminal indulgence, from a Saturday night, when he received his wages, to the succeeding Sunday night.

Another circumstance that contributed much to form his habits of intemperance was, that at the age of thirteen years he became a ringer at the parish church in his native village. He paid a footing of half-a-crown, which was expended in intoxicating liquor. Fines were exacted for non-attendance at the periods appointed for ringing the bells, and these fines also were spent at the adjoining public house. He became a singer at the same church at the age of fifteen years, and then also paid a fine, and got drunk. To the great honour of the clergyman who now has the cure of the parish, and is one of the warmest promoters of Temperance Societies, the ringers and singers of that church have relinquished the inconsistency of making their connection with the public worship of God the means of leading them to houses of disorder and revelry. On one occasion, he united himself to a body of Dissenters, in Kendal, and was not intoxicated for half a year, though he did not wholly give up the use of intoxicating liquors. At the expiration of the half year, his conduct became as notorious as before, and he was separated from his religious connection. On another occasion, he contrived to keep sober for six months. He was married three years ago, and this circumstance, instead of inducing him to live soberly, as his wife worked in the factory, gave him more ample means of indulgence, which he abused exceedingly. After his marriage, he brought upon himself and wife the greatest misery. It was long before he could furnish a house, and he often beat his wife severely, when deprived of self-possession by intoxication. After a fit of intemperance, he was in the habit of starving himself, to pay off his drunken shots, so that he always contrived to be in good credit with the landlords. More than once he has been on the point of self-destruction.

This is a case where there was unusual temptation to intemperance. At a very early age R. J. was initiated into habits of drinking intoxicating liquids, and since having engaged in a very laborious employment, to perform which all men seemed to agree that a free use of stimulating liquors was necessary, he has been obliged to mingle with persons of the same trade who are notoriously addicted to drunkenness.

He joined the Preston Temperance Society in June, 1832, after having subjected himself to a trial for a month, since when he has always lived consistently. He finds that since he took more food instead of intoxicating beverage, he can perform more labour, and enjoys a peace of mind and happiness to which he was before a stranger. In short, he says, "I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude for the benefit I have received from the change."

2.—E. D. aged thirty-two years, sawyer, began to follow his present employment in 1822. Till then he lived soberly. He was first induced to take ale freely, by being persuaded that he could not pursue his work without it. He soon became a convert to this injurious supposition, and after a time he began to indulge to great excess, till he was even notorious among the intemperate. He usually set apart Saturdays and Mondays for drinking; always having a strong impression of the sanctity of the Sabbath, he abstained on that day. On one occasion he drank six days together. He has frequently drunk eight and ten pints of ale in a day; and before he became a member of the Temperance Society, he usually drank seven or eight glasses of black beer and rum on a Saturday night. He has been strongly tempted to destroy himself, when suffering from remorse of conscience. Though he has no child, and was able to earn considerable wages, he became involved in his circumstances, through his criminal indulgence. When intoxicated, his wife (who he declares, with simple and genuine pathos, "is the most deserving and industrious wife in Preston") fled from him in terror, and his little dog shrank from him in dismay. He attended in the

theatre at the formation of the Preston Temperance Society, in March, 1832, since when he has faithfully and scrupulously kept the pledge. There is a circumstance or two connected with his conviction that I cannot omit. While at the theatre, a speaker remarked that "the advocates of Temperance Societies had little hope of reclaiming those who had contracted a habit of drinking intoxicating liquors to excess, but they would accomplish much if they could induce those who were sober persons to continue sober." "What," says E. D., "is my case, then, considered nearly hopeless by those who are conversant with the operations of these societies? desperate indeed is my condition!" So strongly did this thought seize upon his imagination, that in a fit of desperation he signed the pledge, and went home in a state of mind he never speaks of without tears. He rushed past his wife, and into his bed room, "where," says he, "I prayed to the Searcher of hearts, that He would aid me to keep my hasty resolution." Shortly after he came forward publicly, as an advocate of the cause he had espoused, and though his relation was simple and broken, I never witnessed an equal impression produced by the most eloquent men of the present age. From his humble, religious, and firm deportment, E. D. is a general and deserved favourite with all who know him. He says, "My wife now, instead of being afraid of me, receives me with a smile of welcome, and even my little dog runs to meet me with delight, for he knows that his master has now become a sober man." He declares that experience has convinced him that no intoxicating liquor is necessary to enable a healthy man to perform his labour, and he finds that he can perform more work with less fatigue now than he could while he drank intoxicating liquors.

This is another striking instance of a person engaged in a most laborious employment testifying that natural food and natural beverage alone are necessary to fit a man for work, and that the commonly received opinion, that ale contributes to regular muscular exertion, is founded in error or vice. I would also observe that this case (as well as every other case that has come under my notice) should convince religious men that there is no ground for fearing that Temperance Societies will injuriously interfere with religion. E. D. is most punctual in his religious duties, and I believe as sincere in his professions as any man that ever bowed before a Christian altar. Strange indeed would it be, if a Society, whose professed object is to diminish immorality, should be detrimental to that religion whose essence is morality.

3.—R. C., aged forty-five years, cotton spinner, states that his father was a blacksmith, a man of very intemperate habits. He frequently came home in a state of beastly intoxication, abused his wife and children, and often turned them out of doors. He died when Robert was thirteen years of age. At that age Robert began to take beer to excess, and at the age of seventeen he became a confirmed drunkard. At that age he attended double wheels in a cotton factory, and could earn upwards of thirty shillings a week. Of this sum he usually gave fifteen shillings to his mother, and the rest he spent at the taverns. At the end of the week he always got drunk, and on Sunday he often turned his mother out of doors, because she would not give him her money, after he had spent his own. At about eighteen years of age he married a woman by whom he had afterwards five children. After marriage he indulged more than before, and for seven years he was scarcely ever in bed on a Saturday night, or sober on a Sunday. Eleven years after his marriage, his wife died, "heart broken." From the night on which she died till the day her body was buried he was never a moment sober. He chiefly drank ale, till ten years ago, when he be-

gan to take ardent spirits, which he says "made him mad." He often broke all the furniture in his reach when he went home, has repeatedly seized an axe to murder his wife, and when he has awoke from a fit of intoxication he has frequently found himself stretched upon his house floor with a carving knife in his hand, and the wreck of his furniture strewed about him. He had been a drunkard twenty-nine years before he became a member of the Preston Temperance Society. He has been connected with the Society ten months. Since he signed the pledge he has never violated it, and for twenty-four weeks has totally refrained from all kinds of intoxicating liquors. He is now a member of a society of Christians, is a warm and public advocate of Temperance Societies, his family are much improved in their circumstances, and Robert is a respectable and useful member of society.

Many of the most deplorable parts of Robert's dark history have been purposely withheld. What has been related is sufficient to strike any one with horror at the fearful results of parental turpitude, early indulgence, and the enraptured passion it exhibits: at the same time, it may serve to encourage us "to hope against hope;" for here we have a human being sunk into the lowest depths of depravity, rescued by the force of persuasion, and the influence of example.

4.—G. G., aged forty, plasterer, is the son of an intemperate father. He began to drink to excess when fifteen years old, and continued his evil practices till he was twenty-one. He then became a member of the Methodist Society, and remained a sober man for three years. At the age of twenty-four years, he fell away to his "old practices," and continued them till he joined the Temperance Society eighteen weeks ago. Since then he has totally abstained from all intoxicating liquors. He has a wife and four children, whom he used to turn out of doors every week, and he frequently destroyed his furniture when drunk. He was so exceedingly disorderly, that the neighbours, wherever he went, considered him a public nuisance, in consequence of which he was often obliged to change the place of his residence. His poverty through intemperance was frequently extreme, and his wife and children were often nearly famished for want of food. He states that he is now in the enjoyment of perfect health, his wife and he have not had a wrong word since he joined the Temperance Society, and he can perform more labour than ever he could before; in fact, he is never tired with working now; and, he adds, there is no one in Preston more happy than he and his family. He signed the *moderation* pledge last November, but as he was not restricted from taking ale, he found himself still unable to resist temptation and the force of habit. He was expelled from the Society for being drunk, but joined it again, and signed the *abstinence* pledge, since when he has never tasted of any kind of intoxicating liquors.

George's father had five sons, all of whom became drunkards, an almost sure result of evil example and defective restraint in early life. Of this case some may say, they doubt of his permanent security, as he fell after three years sobriety. They should remember, however, that he has this sure protection, that he will not now on any account taste of any kind of intoxicating liquor, whereas before he did not know the necessity of totally "fleeing from temptation," in order to ensure a complete deliverance from the power of his enemy. This is but part of the Christian creed, but it is not sufficiently enforced. There are indulgences which some men may partake of in moderation, but which others cannot touch with safety. A man should always particularly avoid his besetting sins: if he approach but within sight of them he is lost.

5. J. G., aged forty-three years, mechanic, went to sea when he was sixteen years old, where he remained nine years, eight and a half years of which he was in the British navy. He dates his habits of intemperance from his going to sea. When he left sea, he had £60 to receive, all of which, sailor like, he spent in six weeks. He continued a drunkard till the 16th of February last, when he signed the abstinence pledge. Since then, he has not tasted of any kind of intoxicating liquors. Eleven months before, he signed the common temperance pledge, but this did not prevent him from drinking fifteen or sixteen pints of ale in a day. He has a wife and five children, was in constant work, and three of his children, and yet was always in straits before he became a consistent member of the Temperance Society. His wife says, "she never knew what happiness was before then." He is very robust in person, constant at his work, regular in his attendance at church, happy in his mind, and his wife and children exult in the change of their circumstances. His wife emphatically declares, "that though they have been married seven years, their happiness only began six months ago!" No person but those who visit the houses of these reformed drunkards can form an idea of the increase of comfort which these men now enjoy at home; and to describe the thankfulness and satisfaction of their wives would be impossible. The introduction of the Temperance Society has been a happy day for Preston.

THE DELUSION.

No wonder that drunkenness, from *ale drinking*, should disgrace this country, when it is constantly recommended by persons of influence, praised for its nutritive properties, and actually propounded as the reformer of morals!

Sir W. Ingleby stated that "barley, in Norfolk, cost about 20s. per quarter, but before that could be made into ale, it would cost above £3. In a moral point of view, the malt tax was calculated to brutalize the people."

Mr. Joseph Hume "thought that the malt tax might be reduced, with an advantage to the *morals* of the people, who, if they could get *good beer*, would not resort so much to *ardent spirits*."

Sir Robert Peel observed, "that the *comforts* of the labouring classes were proved to have *increased* by the *increased consumption of malt*."

Mr. Buckingham writes thus: "We should rejoice to see the duties on malt and hops entirely removed, a *wholesome* and *nutritious* beverage, without tax or restraint, in the power of every man to brew for his own use."

These authorities just repeat the opinions of their fathers, without ever subjecting them to the test of experience or chemical scrutiny. Unfortunately, the greatest part of the members of the House of Commons are landed proprietors, and, as such, are anxious to promote the increased consumption of ale, that they may realize the benefit in the increased demand for barley. In contradistinction to the testimonies above adduced, I take upon me to assert, that ale would not, with the duty on malt remitted, be "a *cheap, wholesome, and nutritious beverage*;" that its increased consumption is any thing but an indication of increased comforts among the working people; and that it is a powerful promoter of immorality, and that the cheaper it is and the more immorality will prevail. So far as Lancashire is concerned, I believe I may presume to have had greater opportunities of ascertaining the influence of ale drinking than any of these gentlemen, and I know that my opinion is confirmed by all the disinterested in this district who have paid attention to the subject.

The nutrition of ale, compared with the barley, may be seen by reference to the article headed "The Great Delusion," in my June number. Let this matter be frequently discussed, and the public will have a chance of being delivered from the erroneous opinions which many are labouring to diffuse.

THE SUPPRESSION OF DRUNKENNESS.

The following extract from M'Culloch's Dictionary of Commerce shows the inefficiency of legal enactments for the suppression of drunkenness, and the importance of trying to effect the temperance reformation by *moral* means.

"During the latter part of the reign of George I., and the earlier part of that of George II., gin drinking was exceedingly prevalent; and the cheapness of ardent spirits, and the multiplication of public houses, were denounced from the pulpit, and in the presentations of grand juries, as pregnant with the most destructive consequences to the health and morals of the community. At length, ministers determined to make a vigorous effort to put a stop to the further use of spirituous liquors, except as a cordial or medicine. For this purpose, an act was passed in 1736, the history and effects of which deserve to be studied by all who are clamorous for an increase of the duties on spirits. Its preamble is to this effect: 'Whereas the drinking of spirituous liquors, or strong water, is become very common, especially among people of lower and inferior rank, the constant and excessive use of which tends greatly to the destruction of their health, rendering them unfit for useful labour and business, debauching their morals, and inciting them to perpetrate all vices; and the ill consequences of the excessive use of such liquors are not confined to the present generation, but extend to future ages, and tend to the destruction and ruin of this kingdom.' The enactments were such as might be expected to follow a preamble of this sort. They were not intended to repress the vice of gin drinking, but to root it out altogether. To accomplish this, a duty of *twenty shillings* a gallon was laid on spirits, exclusive of a heavy licence duty on retailers. Extraordinary encouragements were at the same time held out to informers, and a fine of £100 was ordered to be rigorously exacted from those who, were it even through inadvertency, should vend the smallest quantity of spirits which had not paid the full duty. Here was an act which might, one should think, have satisfied the bitterest enemy of gin. But instead of the anticipated effects, it produced those directly opposite. The respectable dealers withdrew from a trade proscribed by the legislature; so that the spirit business fell almost entirely into the hands of the lowest and most profligate characters, who, as they had nothing to lose, were not deterred by penalties from breaking through all its provisions. The populace having in this, as in all similar cases, espoused the cause of the smugglers and unlicensed dealers, the officers of the revenue were openly assaulted in the streets of London and other great towns; informers were hunted down like wild beasts; and drunkenness, disorders, and crimes increased with a frightful rapidity. 'Within two years of the passing of the act,' says Tindal, 'it had become *odious and contemptible*, and policy as well as humanity forced the commissioners of excise to mitigate its penalties.'—(*Continuation of Rapin*, vol. viii. p. 358. ed. 1759.) The same historian mentions (vol. viii. p. 390.) that during the two years in question, no fewer than 12,000 persons were convicted of offences connected with the sale of spirits. But no exertion on the part of the revenue officers and magistrates could stem the torrent of smuggling. According to a statement made by the Earl of Cholmondeley in the House of Lords—(*Timberland's De-*

bates in the House of Lords, vol. viii. p. 338.)—it appears, that at the very moment when the sale of spirits was declared to be illegal, and every possible exertion made to suppress it, upwards of **SEVEN MILLIONS** of gallons were annually consumed in London, and other parts immediately adjacent! Under such circumstances, government had but one course to follow—to give up the unequal struggle. In 1742, the high prohibitory duties were accordingly repealed, and such moderate duties imposed, as were calculated to increase the revenue, by increasing the consumption of legally distilled spirits. The bill for this purpose was vehemently opposed in the House of Lords by most of the bishops, and many other peers, who exhausted all their rhetoric in depicting the mischievous consequences that would result from a toleration of the practice of gin-drinking. To these declamations it was unansweredly replied, that whatever the evils of the practice might be, it was impossible to repress them by prohibitory enactments; and that the attempts to do so had been productive of far more mischief than had ever resulted, or could be expected to result, from the greatest abuse of spirits. The consequences of the change were highly beneficial. An instant stop was put to smuggling; and if the vice of drunkenness was not materially diminished, it has never been stated that it was increased.”

BEER AND SPIRITS.

I would further notice the striking *difference between spirits and beer*, in the mode of their operation: beer makes persons first heavy, then stupid, and then senseless; the beer-drinker becomes more drunken than the drinker of spirits, and shows his condition more, but he is, in that very proportion, more harmless to society; his very helplessness and inactivity give a sort of pledge for the security of others. In the case of dram-drinking, however, the effects are not besetting or stupifying; spirits are less narcotic, but more exciting, than beer; so far from incapacitating for action, they stimulate to it; they increase and irritate the passions; they heat the brain, by inflaming the quality and quickening the circulation of the blood; but they are so far from disqualifying the man from executing the designs which he may meditate under such a morbid excitement, that they quicken him to every kind of exertion which is necessary to his purpose; a man can, in the course of the day, drink, and multitudes do drink, twenty or more glasses of spirits, without being visibly affected by them, while the drinker of porter or ale would be seen reeling about the street: the effects produced in these cases being so different, there is less disgust excited in spectators for the drinker of spirits, and consequently he is less likely to be shamed out of the habit; the very little time, too, which is requisite for drinking drams, and the facilities for obtaining them which every where abound, are still further favourable to that system: I apprehend, therefore, that a broad distinction is to be taken between drinking and drunkenness, or between the use of spirits and of beer. Beer, in order to produce palpable intoxication, must be drunk in large quantities, while enough of spirits can be obtained for producing the greatest moral mischief, without the effects upon the drinker being so apparent. I am the more desirous of adverting to this distinction, because it has been said there is less drunkenness than there was. This may be readily admitted; but the concession does not prove that there is less drinking or less crime. There is perhaps less of gross drunkenness brought before the public eye than when beer was the national liquor; but there is probably, on that account, so much more drinking and so much more crime.—

Mr. J. Poynder, late Under Sheriff for London and Middlesex.

VARIETIES.

The expense incurred in the fitting up of public house bars in London is almost incredible, every one vying with his neighbour in convenient arrangements, general display, rich carving, brass-work, finely veined mahogany, and ornamental painting. The carving of the ornament alone, in that of "The Grapes" public house, in Old Street Road, cost £100; the workmanship was by one of the first carvers in wood in London. Three public houses, or rather gin-shops, have been lately fitted up in Lamb's Conduit-street, at the expense for the bar alone of upwards of £2000 each.—*London Encyclopaedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture.*

The "Town of Ross" temperance ship is now insured at one per cent. less premium, on account of being manned by temperance members. The following is the declaration signed by the crew :

"We agree during this voyage to abstain from the use of *distilled spirits*, mixed or unmixed, both by sea and land, except as a medicine; and we also agree, while members of this Society, to discountenance the causes and practice of intemperance, in all suitable ways."

In Southampton, a "store," to borrow an American phrase, has been opened for the purpose of selling to children a small glass of gin at the price of a halfpenny, the glass itself being formed of a sweatmeat, which they take away with them.

Mr. Thomas Shillitoe, of Tottenham, observed, at the London anniversary meeting, in his early days he had received a fright, the influence of which he had always experienced on his nervous system. When a young man, he was advised to adopt a generous diet, which he did for years, but not improving, he was ordered to take a bottle per day. The disease still continued to increase, and he was ultimately recommended to try a different regimen. He omitted the wine, and confined himself almost exclusively to vegetable food; and he was now thankful to state, that though he was eighty years of age, he was stronger than when he was thirty. He considered his own case a decided proof that stimulating food was unnecessary, and often injurious; and that even where the practice had been had recourse to, no harm would result from its abandonment.

At a temperance meeting in the state of New York, a young lady was asked if she would give her name to the pledge of total abstinence? She refused; adding, that she was in no danger of being a drunkard, and there was therefore no necessity. When told that if not necessary for herself, it might do good to others, the answer was, "I have no influence." Her friend left her, and passing round the assembly, put the same question to every person, "Will you sign the agreement?" Very many did sign, and among others, some ten or twelve of the children of the school occupying the house where we were assembled, and of which the young lady referred to was the preceptress. She saw her pupils, one after another, advance and request their names to be enrolled amongst those who covenanted that day, to dissolve all connection, and to renounce all fellowship, with ardent spirit; and she saw that they had influence over one another, and even over the future destinies of their country and of the world. Then, with tears, she came to the writer of this, and requested her name to be put down on the list; "for," said she, "if I have no influence over my pupils, they have influence over me."